UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 1:13 cv 11512

************	*****
RICHARD HOUPERT,	*
Plaintiff	*
	*
VS.	*
	*
STANLEY BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC.,	*
HAPPY MADISON, INC.,	*
HAPPY MADISON PRODUCTIONS,	*
SONY ELECTRONICS, INC.,	*
COLUMBIA PICTURES INDUSTRIES, INC.,	*
Defendants	*
	*

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

PARTIES:

- 1. The plaintiff, Richard Houpert (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is an individual who resides in Mansfield, Bristol County, Massachusetts.
- 2. On information and belief, the defendant, Stanley Black & Decker (U.S.) Inc., (hereinafter "Black & Decker") is a legal corporation with a principal place of business at 1000 Stanley Drive, New Britain, Connecticut, and which was at all relevant times conducting business in Massachusetts
- 3. On information and belief, the Defendant, Happy Madison Inc., (hereinafter referred to as "Madison, Inc.") is legal corporation with a principal place of business at 17 North Street, Manchester, NH and which was at all relevant times conducting business in Massachusetts
- 4. On information and belief, the Defendant, Happy Madison Productions, (hereinafter referred to as "Madison.") is a legal corporation with a principal place of business at 10202 W. Washington Blvd, Judy Garland Building, Culver City, CA and which was at all relevant times conducting business in Massachusetts.

- 5. On information and belief, Sony Electronics, Inc., (hereinafter referred to as "Sony") is a legal corporation with a principal place of business at 16530 VIA Esprillo, San Diego, CA and which was at all relevant times conducting business in Massachusetts.
- 6. On information and belief, Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc., (hereinafter referred to as "Columbia") is a legal corporation with a principal place of business at 10202 W. Washington Blvd. Culver City, CA and which was at all relevant times conducting business in Massachusetts.

JURISDICTION

- 7. Defendants transact business in Massachusetts such that they are subject to personal jurisdiction in Massachusetts.
- 8. Defendants are subject to the jurisdiction of this court pursuant to the Massachusetts long arm statute.
- 9. The District Court has jurisdiction over the matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 since there is complete diversity of citizenship between the Plaintiffs and each defendant and amount in controversy also exceeds \$75,000.00. Venue is proper in the District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 since the Plaintiff resides in Massachusetts and the events leading up to the Plaintiff's injuries occurred in Massachusetts.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

- 10. This is an action for personal injuries sustained by the Plaintiff, Richard Houpert, on May 23, 2011, when he suffered fractures and amputation to the fingers on his right major hand while using a defective and dangerous table saw (Delta uni-saw 3 hp serial #98D91964 hereinafter referred to as "the saw"), which was designed, manufactured, distributed and/or sold by Defendant, Black & Decker.
- 11. At all times pertinent hereto, defendant, Black & Decker was engaged in the design, development, assembly, manufacture, testing, inspection, packaging, promotion, advertising, marketing, distribution and sale of the Delta saw being used by Plaintiff.
- 12. At all relevant times, the Plaintiff, Richard Houpert, was a union worker engaged in creating sets for the Columbia Pictures/Sony Adam Sandler movie: "I Hate You Dad"/"That's My Boy" being filmed in Boston, Massachusetts.

- On or about May 25, 2011, Richard Houpert, while in the course of his employment, had his right, major hand drawn into the saw, resulting in serious injuries including but not limited to fractures and partial amputations of his fingers.
- 14. The set design and construction was being performed at 415 East Street, Boston, Massachusetts a location that was under the direct control, management and/or supervision of the Defendants Columbia, Sony, Madison Inc. and/or Madison.
- 15. On information and belief, the Defendant, Madison, Inc., was the corporate and/or parent company of the Defendant, Madison.
- 16. On or about May 25, 2011, Madison, Inc. and Madison were the producers and/or in charge of production for the movie that the Plaintiff was creating sets for.
- 17. On information and belief, the Defendant, Sony was the parent company of and/or partnering with the Defendant, Columbia which owned the rights to the movie being produced and for which the Plaintiff was creating sets at the time of his injury.

CAUSES OF ACTION:

COUNT I:

RICHARD HOUPERT v. BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC. NEGLIGENCE

- 18. Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- 19. The injuries sustained by Plaintiff were the direct and proximate result of the carelessness and negligence of the defendant as follows:
 - Defendant negligently designed, developed, licensed, assembled, manufactured, inspected, tested, marketed, advertised, sold and distributed said product.
 - b. Defendant negligently failed to warn or instruct or adequately warn or adequately instruct plaintiff and other users of said product of its dangerous and defective characteristics, and of the safe and proper method of using said product.

- c. Defendant negligently distributed said product and placed it in the channels of trade, when it knew or with reasonable care should have known said product to be dangerous and defective in nature, design, and materials and in a dangerous and defective condition, and negligently placed said product in the channels of trade in the exercise of reasonable care ought to have foreseen would probably carry said product into contact with persons such as the plaintiff and other users who were ignorant of its dangerous and defective nature and condition, and defendant negligently failed to use reasonable care to prevent injury to such persons, including the plaintiff.
- d. Defendant failed in incorporating available safety devices in the design of the saw which would have prevented the Plaintiff's accident and failed to inform the public of the availability of these devices.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment against defendant together with interest and costs.

COUNT II:

RICHARD HOUPERT V. BLACK & DECKER (U.S.) INC.: BREACH OF IMPLIED AND EXPRESS WARRANTIES

- 20. Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- 21. Pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 106, §2-316A and §2-314, defendant expressly and impliedly warranted to plaintiff and to the general public that said product was safe, merchantable and fit for its intended and foreseeable purposes and uses. Defendant breached its warranties because said product was unsafe, not of merchantable quality and unfit for its intended and foreseeable uses and purposes. The Defendant also breached the warranty of fitness for a particular purpose and express warranties. Plaintiff relied on the warranties made by defendant and plaintiff sustained injury as the direct and proximate result of the breaches of warranties by defendant.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment against defendant together with interest and costs.

COUNT V

RICHARD HOUPERT v. MADISON, INC. and MADISON NEGLIGENCE

- Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- On May 25, 2011, the Defendants were responsible for the production of the movie for which the Plaintiff was creating the set.
- 24. On May 25, 2011, the Defendants, their agents, servants, or others for whom they had a legal responsibility had a duty to provide reliable, safe equipment and a safe working environment for those persons working on the set.
- 25. The Defendants breached their duty by providing saws which did not have saw stops, safety guards or other safety equipment.
- 26. As a direct consequence of the Defendants acts and/or omissions, the Plaintiff was caused to sustain serious physical injuries, loss of income and other damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants in an amount this Court deems just and appropriate inclusive of interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT VI

RICHARD HOUPERT v. MADISON, INC. and MADISON GROSS NEGLIGENCE

- Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- 28. The cost to provide saws with saw stops, guards, or other safety equipment was minimal compared to the enormity of the risk of injury to the users of the saw.
- 29. The Defendants owed a duty to the Plaintiff and all other users of the saws to provide equipment that was safe to be used for its intended purpose.

- 30. The Defendants breached their duty and engaged in grossly negligent conduct and willful, wanton and reckless misconduct to wit their failure to provide table saws that had saw stops, guards or other safety equipment installed.
- 31. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts and/or omissions, the Plaintiff was caused to sustain serious physical injuries, loss of income and other damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants in an amount this Court deems just and appropriate inclusive of interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT VII

RICHARD HOUPERT v. SONY and COLUMBIA NEGLIGENCE

- Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- 33. On May 25, 2011, the Defendants owned and/or controlled the rights to the movie being produced and for which the Plaintiff was creating sets at the time of his injury.
- On May 25, 2011, the Defendants, their agents, servants, or others for whom they had a legal responsibility had a duty to provide reliable, safe equipment and a safe working environment for those persons working on the set and working to create their movie.
- 35. The Defendants, their agents, servants, or others for whom they had a legal responsibility breached their duty by providing saws which did not have saw stops, safety guards or other safety equipment.
- As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts and/or omissions, or the acts and/or omissions of those for whom they were legally responsible, the Plaintiff was caused to sustain serious physical injuries, loss of income and other damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants in an amount this Court deems just and appropriate inclusive of interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT V

RICHARD HOUPERT v. MADISON, INC., MADISON, SONY and COLUMBIA NEGLIGENCE

- 37. Plaintiff repeats and restates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs and incorporates said allegations herein by reference.
- 38. On May 25, 2011, the Defendants were responsible for the production of the movie for which the Plaintiff was creating the set.
- 39. At all relevant times, the Defendants provided a monetary safety fund to ensure the safety of the persons working on the movie set.
- 40. The Defendants, their agents, servants, or others for whom they had a legal responsibility had a duty to ensure that the funds were actually used to provide safe equipment and a safe environment for the workers.
- 41. The Defendants breached their duty and negligently failed to provide saw stops, guards and other safety equipment until after the Plaintiff's accident.
- 42. The Defendants' negligent acts and/or omissions were the proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants in an amount this Court deems just and appropriate inclusive of interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

PLAINTIFF CLAIMS TRIAL BY JURY.

Respectfully Submitted, Plaintiff by his Attorney

/s/ Joan S. Amon Joan S. Amon, Esq. BBC#548239 90 Concord Avenue Belmont, Ma 02478 (617) 489-9800 JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Houpert, Richard (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bristol (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			DEFENDANTS Stanley Black & Decker (U.S.) Inc., Happy Madison Inc., Happy Madison Productions., Sony Electronics, Inc., Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.,				
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Ad Joan S. Amon, Esq. 90 Concord Avenue Belmont, MA 02478 (61)	ddress, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC		Box Only)	III. C		RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
				(For Diversity Cases Only) PT		PTF DEF	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No.	ot a Party)	Citi	zen of This State	of Business In Th	nis State	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship)	of Parties in Item III)	Citi	zen of Another State	of Business In A	rincipal Place	
				izen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only	y)		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
CONTRACT	TOL	PERSONAL INJUR		625 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims Act	
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	.	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	0	690 Other	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Lindomisj	☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical			PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability			830 Patent 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	1		540 Hademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPER	RTY 🗆	710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	□ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 371 Truth in Lending	0	720 Labor/Management	864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	la.	Relations 740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage		751 Family and Medical		☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability		Leave Act		☐ 896 Arbitration	
	Medical Malpractice			790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS D	Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act/Review or Appeal of	
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee		meome because	or Defendant)	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of	
220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacat	te		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	State Statutes	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence			26 USC 7609	Sale States	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	530 General	-	IMMIGRATION			
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty Other:	lo	462 Naturalization Application	1		
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Ot		465 Other Immigration			
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights		Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition☐ 560 Civil Detainee -	'				
		Conditions of					
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	Confinement		Reinstated or	ferred from	trict	
	emoved from 3 attace Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	F	Reopened Anoth (specify	er District Litigatio		
	Cite the U.S. Civil St	atute under which you	are filir	ng (Do not cite jurisdictional st	uutes untess utversuy).		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of c	ause: were amputated w	vhile u	sing a saw manufactur	red, designed and/or pro	y if demanded in complaint:	
VII. REQUESTED IN		S IS A CLASS ACTIO	ON	DEMAND \$	CHECK TED ON	y	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE	23, F.R.Cv.P.		1,000,000.00	JURY DEMANI	D: Yes No	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		- OF DE CORD	DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF A		EY OF RECORD			
06/25/2013		/s/Joan S. Am	non				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
	AMOUNT	APPLYING IF	P	JUDGE	MAG. J	UDGE	

Case 1:13-cv-11512-RWZ Document 1 Filed 06/25/13 Page 10 of 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

itle of	case (name	of first party on each side only) Richa	rd Houpert v. Stanl	ey Black and Deck	cer U.S. Inc.
Catego	ry in which	the case belongs based upon the num	bered nature of su	it code listed on th	e civil cover sheet. (See local
	.1(a)(1)).				
7	L	410, 441, 470, 535, 830*, 891, 893, 895,	R.23, REGARDLES	SS OF NATURE OF	SUIT.
_	1.	110, 130, 140, 160, 190, 196, 230, 240,	200 320 362 370. 3	71, 380, 430, 440,	442, 443, 445, 446, 448, 710, 720,
	11.	740 790 820* 840*, 850, 870, 971.			
\checkmark	ш.	120, 150, 151, 152, 153, 195, 210, 220, 422, 423, 450, 460, 462, 463, 465, 480, 950.	490, 510, 500, 510,		
		*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121. for	patent, trademark	or copyright case	s.
Title a distric	nd number, t please inc	if any, of related cases. (See local rul licate the title and number of the first f	e 40.1(g)). If more tiled case in this co	than one prior rela urt.	ted case has been filed in this
Has a	nrior action	n between the same parties and based	on the same claim	ever been filed in	this court?
i ias a	prior della			YES	NO 4
Does	the compla	int in this case question the constitution	onality of an act of	congress affecting	the public interest? (See 28 U
§2403	3)			YES	NO 🗸
		street or amployee of th	ne U.S. a party?		
lf so,	is the U.S.	A. or an officer, agent or employee of th		YES	NO 🗸
		ired to be heard and determined by a c	lietrict court of thr	ee judges pursuan	t to title 28 USC §2284?
Is thi	s case requ	ired to be heard and determined by a c	iligation down to	YES	NO 🗸
Do <u>a</u> Mass	<u>II</u> of the par sachusetts	ties in this action, excluding governm ("governmental agencies"), residing in	ental agencies of ti 1 Massachusetts re	he united states are side in the same of	nd the Commonwealth of livision? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d
		If yes, in which division do all of the	e non-governmenta	al parties reside?	proceeding
	A.	Fastern Division	Central Division	1	Western Division
	В.	If no, in which division do the majo residing in Massachusetts reside?	rity of the plaintiffs	s or the only partie	s, excluding governmental agenc
		Eastern Division	Central Division		Western Division
. If fil sub	ling a Notice mit a separ	e of Removal - are there any motions pate sheet identifying the motions)	ending in the state	YES	e attention of this Court? (If yes,
	E TYPE OR	PRINT)			
DIEAC	- 111 - 011	loan S. Amon. Esq.			
TTOP	HEV'S NAM	Juan J. Amon, 204			
TTOP	NEY'S NAM	Joan S. Amon, Esq. dord Avenue, Belmont, MA 02478			

(CategoryForm12-2011.wpd - 12/2011)